#1026
Wednesday, August 10, 1966

You think it's all right, John? Yes. So what kind of questions are there that were perhaps left over from last time or new questions? Who wants to start?

_____: Ah, Mr. Nyland, how does one, ah, develop guts when one is constantly afraid?

How does one develop what? _____: Guts.

Guts? _____: Right.

Is one constantly afraid? _____: Ah, very much of the time.

Any particular thing you are afraid of?

_____: Um, it seems like everything--a lot of things.

People. _____: Yes.

Or different things--what are you afraid of?

_____: Oh, am, afraid to make mistakes, afraid of, ah, failure or success. Afraid of, ah, relationships with people. Ah, -----

Are you dependent on them? As a relationship do you need them? Do you need people?

_____: I suppose I do. Yes.

For what? Admiration?

_____: Um, sometimes.

Approbation from them, from their side. Why do you want it? Because you don't have it yourself? _____: Probably.

And you are a little afraid of yourself not having enough to maintain yourself, that you need something from someone else.

_____: Right.

In every way you think, in many different directions, or one or two? Whatever it may be, you see.

_____: Probably more so in ....

Yes. Are you afraid of eating?

_____: Ah, sometimes.

When you are by yourself?

_____: Ah, not as much, unless ...

No. Are you afraid now?

_____: Not exactly ...

So you can overcome it, can't you? _____: Yes.

When you don't think about it, you're not afraid. _____: Right.

As soon as you start to think about how you are, what other people might think of you--then you have to have, of course, for that a certain ideal of yourself of how you should behave. Where does that come from? That picture that you have as an ideal person--on what is it based? On something of yourself, or something that someone else has told you, or that there is a certain person that you try to imitate.

_____: I would imagine it was a combination of what I've been told by others--parents, etc.--what images of other people I think I should be like and ...

And you believe it? _____: I must!

Why? If you were confronted with that and you had fear and you still continue, what have been the consequences, except of course a kind of a funny feeling for yourself. Was there anything dire happening to you?

_____: No. And generally even if it is, it is much better than not going ahead ...

Have you ever had moments when you had no fear? _____: Yes.

You have. In doing what?

_____: What comes to mind--I haven't given a lot of thought--my enjoyment of ...

Yes. But when you walk, are you fearful?

_____: Ah, sometimes, sometimes not.

No, but really, when you walk on the street?

_____: Sometimes I am a lot.

About what then? That something will happen to you? Other people? You shy away from them? _____: No.

Particularly when you know that they don't do anything to you because you pass them. And they maybe apparently don't have any interest in you. Afterwards are you still afraid? _____: No.

No, so you have moments when you are not afraid? _____: Right.

And the moments that you are not afraid--can you define in what condition you were and can you then repeat it? Lets assume that you have a certain situation in which you are fearful, and you make yourself go through it, and then you find out there was nothing to be afraid about. Then can you make yourself do it again, knowing now that it won't matter, that you're still protected? _____: Doing the same exact ....?

Yes, if you can. You meet someone. Originally you have fear that the person is not eating you up so it's all right. Now you create the same situation. You meet the person again; this time you know that there was no reason for having any fear.

_____: Ah, I think I wouldn't have fear, but possibly sometimes with the same person...

Yes, it may be, of course, with the same person, but then you have a reason to say, "Don't be afraid." I think if you analyze a little bit more the different situations in which you are afraid that there are many, many instances, and many more than you think, that you really need not be afraid, and you know it. If you take situations that are very simple for yourself, that don't involve very much on your own part, that does

not require any particular skill and also in the presence of people with whom you have a fairly good relationship that you do not mind what they think of you--you see not strangers, but people who already know you, who know your value, and for whom your particular behavior may be simply written up as, "Well, it's all right; that's the way she is," about which you need not have any fear. I think there are many relationships and many conditions in which you have no fear whatsoever. Only at times when you are fearful, you start to extend it, thinking that it is happening all the time. If you start from that standpoint--that there is no reason and that only in exceptional cases you have a perfect right to be fearful, you will change your attitude.

_____: Well, sometime back, I didn't. Maybe because I didn't _____ about it as myself as being very fearful, but, ah, when I started observing, I saw how, maybe, it's not always fear, but negativity and fear, one or the other combined....

Whichever.... _____: Takes up, ah...

It's all right. What's the difference? You see, if one, you say now, observes, that's another question. If you're observing, it doesn't matter what kind of a state the object is in. The whole idea of observing would be objectivity of some kind, of something which observes you. And whatever you are. Particular when the requirement is that one should be non-identified, doesn't make any difference in what condition you are. You always remain an object. See, it has nothing to do with the manifestation. The manifestation is judged from an ordinary standpoint of subjectivity. From an objective standpoint, it's a fact of your existence. You see, so if you want to use observation, it's a different question. You can accept yourself for whatever it is, even in the condition where you are in ordinary life fearful; from the standpoint of being awake, you simply exist in that kind of a fearful state, but you don't measure it that way. If you want to observe, start with very simple things to do. And particularly

the things you know you can do, about which you need not have any fear and you can accomplish them. Gradually you extend it in the presence of other people in whom you have confidence and they have confidence in you. If necessary, they can assure you that it's all right. Do ordinary physical activities with which you are familiar and with which you know that there is no particular reason to be afraid and continue with that. If you then wish to observe, you will establish for yourself a certain confidence, which confidence will flow over into other situations where you are at the present time a little less familiar. But above all, don't consider it very important. It really has no value. A person is one way or in the other, sometimes a little disagreeable, not so easy to go through, but don't think too much about it. You're afraid of the thought of that. _____: That isn't important? No, I don't think it's important at all. I would simply say, "Well, there I go, a fearful person." Half the battle! You take it much too serious. But you see, you have to practice at the same time that you attend to things that are simple for you. In that way you build confidence in yourself. What do you do during the day? _____: Ah, well, I had been working as a waitress. Um, I'm in between jobs now. I'm, ah, trying to get a job at night so I can be free in the day to take some voice lessons and go for auditions. Are you afraid when you sing that people will criticize you? _____: Ah, to some extent.

Can you sing by yourself without anyone knowing it, and have you fear then? _____: No.

Are you afraid when you are a waitress that you will drop the dishes? _____: No.

You don't care a damn. Exactly. You're not involved in it. It's only when you have a picture of yourself that you have to live up to that you become afraid that someone else will notice. In 99% of the cases

people are not interested; they really don't care what you are and how you are. And you can clarify it by looking, by walking on the street. People are much too busy with themselves. It's only those that are so-called friends, and among them you separate a few who are critical, and say "I don't want to meet them." And for the time being you try to meet only those who can be lenient with you. _

_____: Those that appear critical?

When they are critical, you avoid them. And those that can agree with you, who care for you and so forth, it doesn't matter. And the image you have of yourself, you gradually start to look at it, if it really has any reason of existence. And if it is based on either hearsay or so-called people telling you how you ought to be, you tell them they don't know anything about it because you know yourself what is better for you. Have belief in yourself. What will you do now as a task to remind you?

_____: To remind me?

You eat three times a day? _____: Will I do it three times a day?

No, you eat three times a day? _____: Yes.

Regularly? _____: Ah, fairly...

Do you like to eat? _____: Oh, yes.

Good, and you go into it with a great deal of gusto? _____: Right.

You sit down and you try to see yourself having fun, and everytime that there is something that looks like fear you say, "Oh no, I like this. I'm having a good time while eating." And say it aloud. Sometimes you say in the midst of your breakfast, "Isn't this wonderful!" Say it. Say it aloud. _____: All right.

Almost convincing yourself. Three times a day. _____: Thank you.

All right? All right. Let me know next week. _____: All right.

Good luck. Yes, John?

John M: The idea of predestination was brought up, and you said, ah, that until one reaches a certain level whereby you could influence situations around one is subject to fate; thereafter it might become free of it. This raises a question in my mind...

Not entirely that way, John. When you, when you use the word predestination, it's a little different. We were talking about astrological influences. Predestination includes the possibility of something that is higher than you which directs you. Astrologically, of course, one is under a certain law.

John: I was using the word on the idea as long as man is unconscious, he cannot really do anything but be subject to influences...

If you want to make a distinction between an unconscious man and a conscious one....

John: Yes, I do.

There is a possibility for a conscious man to be able to see, or to become "Aware" of that what has happened and might happen, and what will happen, from the standpoint of his own makeup. And at that time, it might be possible for a person seeing what would happen if things continued to change them. John: When he is conscious?

Yes. John: This raises a question in my mind. Where once someone becomes acquainted with WORK and the ideas is unconscious--Is that part of his fate? And up to a time when by virtue of WORK he reaches a certain level where he can begin to do something--Are his efforts and everything else he does subject to fate?

The question is--when is one free? John: Right.

That depends entirely on how one grows, and how fast one gets through with the bondage of earth. I mean by that, if a person has on earth, being born a certain obligation, because he happens to be here, this obligation that can be expressed in certain terms--perhaps of quantity, or in any event if he can describe himself as a mechanical creature, that

he is bound by certain things that now, earth, extends to him, that he, because of his own configuration belongs to. Where if that is a quantity that could be expressed as a certain attraction which exists at the present time between himself and earth; then the quantity of that form of energy as expressed in the force has to be overcome by WORK on himself; now when a person WORKS on himself he has to build certain things for being able to exist at a higher level, and at the same time if his aim is to become a Harmonious Man, he has to settle the so-called debt to Mother Nature. The debt to Mother Nature is expressed in the bondage he has towards earth because that's what keeps him here. And for that reason that what belongs to him on earth and belongs to his body, first has to be settled in such a way as a requirement of the laws of nature in the particular coin that is used on the surface of the earth. If one wants to accumulate treasures in heaven, it is necessary to find out what is the kind of coin with which people, as it were, in heaven are being paid. If I compare that with the possibility of an existence, that what belongs to earth is my body; anything that has that kind of a material form belongs here, and also will stay here because it will not go away from earth. That what can go away from earth has a certain density which although at the present time exists on earth can gradually change as density and loosen the bondage with earth, and then live on a different kind of a level. For that kind of an existence of a different kind of density, a different form of payment is needed. But a relationship between that what is higher and what is lower, would indicate that there must be a certain number of quantity of material belonging to a lower grade, and equivalent to a lesser quantity of material which happens to be of a higher intensity. So that when I want to pay my debt to nature, I can pay it in two ways. One unconsciously, living out my life on earth and simply paying for my existence with my body, and finally in dying, settling the account. The other is that realizing that I have to pay this, that I try to convert it into a different kind of coin,

I call it coin--a different level of measurement or a different _____ , lets say, form of money which has a relationship to that what is of earth as if it is less dense. So that the quality of that new form of payment is, in the terminology of Ouspensky, is 30,000 against 1. So that the total amount of payment as expressed by whatever is the bondage to earth, can then be settled with a much smaller amount but of a higher quality. Now this is the whole point. When I have paid with my existence and with my development, the amount of debt that I owe to Mother Nature, I am free. When I am free, I need not go back to earth and keep on paying--and it ought to be possible for a person to find ways and means in order to free himself, to pay the debt and still have enough life left to be able to live on a higher plane. So that is the criterion. If I can find out during my life time how much I have to pay and if I know with this kind of a payment which is expressed for me in the amount that I am bound, I will then know that I have paid my debt when I also know that I am free. When I am free, and I can say in reality, "I am Free," then I know that I can live in a different level and don't need the ordinary existence of earth. At the point, if that were true, I can take it or leave it. That is I can be away from earth or return, and I can be then on earth a free man. This remains always a very personal question. And at certain times a person will say I am free from this and that, and when he experiences a certain--under certain circumstances--a different kind of way of being affected, he may find out that he is not free. Now the reality of this is that a person, when he starts to develop, gradually feels that he knows less and less and that the realization of this kind of freedom only will come when he is in a state in which he is totally bound, and when he is totally bound, at that moment there is a possibility of complete freedom. So you see the measurement for finding out the value of the coin in which payment has to be made is quite a different one from ordinary life. It's exactly the increasing

of such difficulties for one's self which would produce more bondage, that I ultimately will reach a state when we are in which I am actually free, but in accordance with everything on earth I am completely bound. You see, I am only indicating that as a kind of measure for me to find out when I am free is not at all the freedom I understand at the present time that I will be able to fly away. The more there is desire in me to fly away, the more I am bound. Now assuming for a moment that one could reach that, in the first place it never can be understood and only by such that also have gone through it. In the second place one is bound not to speak. You see, a person who is free from earth and still is on earth may have, may have a certain function to fulfill, about which function he cannot say anything to anyone. Then only in the form of his behavior, and if he ever were pressed to try to put certain things in words and a form, he is not entitled to it. That is when he understands his function. If he thinks he can do it and if he thinks that he is free and talks about it, he is much more bound. So you see how it is really. From the standpoint of earth it's impossible to understand anything that is above earth. From the standpoint of above earth, it is possible to understand that what is earth. Astrologically speaking I remain on earth; cosmologically speaking, or heliocentrically speaking, I could become free. At the same time the possibility of an existence in which one knows that what is taking place on earth as time from the standpoint of cosmic consciousness becomes a point, in which such point all things exist and which then would mean--the meaning, or rather, that I would have concept by experience of that what is omnipresent..... Does it clarify it a little bit? It's a very difficult subject; it's very difficult to talk about it, but the measurements are entirely different from that what one applies in ordinary life. Only from the standpoint in which that kind of freedom has been reached, it could remain a permanency, and that then there is a free choice of returning to earth and continuing one's life, or actually being at a different place--in which you might

say at a higher place the earth is included. All right? Yes.

_____: Last week I asked about, ah, a myth, a myth of, of perfection, or the myth of the perfect man. I would really like to ask this week, sort of is, ah, a continuation of this. Um, why in general in the WORK it's assumed that inherently, ah, something is better than nothing? Um, I mean by this that the story that Mr. Gurdjieff presents is that of His Endlessness being, finding that the place of His existence is shrinking out. He then has to create the physical universe. Ah, it then becomes our duty to help by adding consciousness or trying to reach for perfection ourselves and to reach consciousness to help with the, ah, support of the universe, or otherwise things tend to, would tend to shrivel--die into nothingness. Now, I really want to ask, ah, what would be the, um, inherent crime of this as opposed to things striving for perfection--I'm not denying that there may be a tendency in all things to wish to grow out? What would be wrong with letting things go back to so-called nothingness out of which I assume everything came originally anyway?

Mr. Nyland: Well, the question of creation is, of course, a very difficult one. When one says it goes back again into nothingness, you assume that there has been a change in the form of life which originally which was different from what it is at the present time. And this is all we can think about, because we cannot conceive of the totality existing "all time." We cannot conceive of anything that is endless. In order to bring back to our mind the way it is and the mind being developed the way it is at the present time on earth which is not the kind of a mind that I could say is omniscient, but it is a certain kind of functioning of one's mind, which allows that particular as a person to be represented on earth and being cognizant of that what takes place on earth and at the same time having an idea of what it might mean to evolve to a higher level. This, I think, is all that you can expect a man really to understand and with that of course he knows that he is bound by his body and that in accordance

with whatever he...everything else that is happening, that also that what happened to him is that he will die. Now, if there is a possibility in which man can believe that he could evolve and free himself from the bondage on earth. This is of course a concept which has been in existence ever since man was born, that for some reason or other, being on earth, not being able to change that, that it might be possible during his lifetime, by means of some kind of an understanding or application of certain rules, that he could then free himself and continue to live, either hereafter or in heaven,or that during his lifetime, as he is now on earth, he could create heaven on earth for himself. Now the relationship as far as man is concerned to the outside world and cosmologically speaking in relation to that what is planetary, solar, and milky way level and so forth finally ending up in The Sun Absolute, simply is something that we assume to be from our knowledge as far as the rest of the universe is concerned--with all the different constellations which happen to exist and for which apparently there is a certain law which such bodies follow. In order to understand this, man must continue to consider himself also as a little world in which he has the same kind of a problem. And the old saying, the macrocosmos and the microcosmus, "So above, so below," simply means that man represents within his own little world, a replica, in different way of proportion to the proportions being the same, but in actuality as far as quantity is concerned, different from that what is existing on a cosmological scale. Now as I think of life being endless or that what is for me in existence before I was born in some form of life and then taking on a form of myself and that what I wish to hope while I'm alive, that that what is still aliveness in me might continue to exist even after the body dies, simply means that I have to find for myself a possibility of extricating or being able to live this kind of life independently of the form in which at the present time it exists. Now with this, comparing it with might be, His Endlessness as the all-knowing

and all-seeing, and you might say, the governor or the manager of the universe. It is a concept that I want to use in order to explain it to myself what I can understand. But in reality it is of course idiotic because one cannot conceive of His Endlessness as being somewhere on the Sun Absolute. If I start to try to understand with my mind what is meant by the totality of all things--or that what I simply use as a few words: omniscence and omnipotence and omnipresent. What is these, what are these kind of a concept for me when I'm constantly under the influence of some kind of a dimensional life. And in order to bring it down, as it were, to earth, that is to the level of my understanding--I assume, and I think that is what Gurdjieff did, allegorically that there is, ah, His Endlessness which is in the center of the universe at a certain place, from which certain things have started to exist in order to explain the existence of that what we now call earth. And that for my mind being on earth and subject to the different laws of earth, and subject to the limitations of earth, that all I can conceive of is the possibility of that happening to some kind of a being of a different kind, and I call it His Endlessness being under a similar situation as I am, when I continue to study myself the way I am. Now if my own self study indicates that I am eaten by time, I call that my lifetime and that after a little while I will die and the body will die; then having in mind the wish to continue to live, which I think is inherent in the quality of lifeness. I mean it is a question that each person would have to settle for himself: what is his life in him, and does he believe that that life always should remain in existence or will it die with him? You see again, this is a concept that some people will want to accept and others will not want to accept it because they will say my life dies when my time dies. _____: This is what...

Mr. Nyland: You see, this is really the point.

_____: My real question, Mr. Nyland, is I really question the basic assumptions of why life, why is it inherently assumed that it is a good

-14- 1026

thing for life to continue? ...

Mr. Nyland: I don't know if it's a good thing; I don't know if it is inherently assumed. I think that some people do believe that and other people don't. I don't think there is any particular agreement.

_____: I thought really that this was sort of a basic assumption of Gurdjieff's teaching. ..... to continue the life....

Mr. Nyland: No, I don't believe that. Yes, for Gurdjieff it is a basic assumption. That is correct, and anyone who cannot believe in that the same way the person who is an ordinary Christian cannot believe in heaven or cannot believe in Christ or not even in God, or a person who wants to consider himself agnostic, or those who have scientific tendencies and consider that their God, all of that maybe, all the differences of different types, of different aspirations and different ways of living, for each person individually, is always his own affair. And when you make a generalized statement that that is the assumption of many people, I don't know. If it is a question: does Gurdjieff base his particular cosmology on that kind of an assumption as an existing something that not only he feels, but that he feels could apply to everybody, I think that's right. I think that is the right of any kind of a teacher to assume that certain things can exist in some people and perhaps it will not exist in someone else--but he is not talking to the others. He is talking only to those who can agree with him and basing it on their own experience that that is the same as the Gurdjieff experience.

_____: Quite honestly, ah, I've sort of come to the conclusion that would seem to make sense to either strive to be to some form of total consciousness, if you wish, ah, positive absolute over just the reverse. Complete unconsciousness, total annihilation of self and everything within one's self, complete unconsciousness. It must seem to me that it's the places in between, ah, having the potentiality for consciousness and, um, actualizing the potentiality and so forth, that this is the difficulty,

this in between place. That there is life in all of us--just a spark. There is a possibility of, of keeping us alive and making perhaps into a plane, and it's, as I see it, this middle position... If I were completely dead, completely without anything, without body or anything else, fine, I wouldn't know the difference.

Mr. Nyland: Well, you see, Tom, you're assuming too many "if's." Now, it is true, of course, if everything was dead, you wouldn't have any trouble. If on the other hand you understood everything, you wouldn't have any thought either. So when one is in between, and you can assume that each person is somewhere in between because I don't think you have so-called living dead people and you don't have over-conscious people, so we are all in the same ... in exactly the same kind of a boat. And it depends then on what you yourself want and what gives you most satisfaction in your own philosophy of life. Whereever you would find yourself or yourself and there is a certain satisfaction and having some of it for you becomes truthful, then of course you adhere to it. Bu if one is still looking for a possibility, you will be swayed one way or the other, and some day you will believe in His Endlessness and some time you will believe in utter unconsciousness. I don't think it can be changed; I think that's exactly the state of one's mind the way it is, and surely is, the state of one's feeling. Now if there is among the different theories, or life philosophies, certain things that appear to each person or any one person and in each case to you or to me--then I will embrace that what gives me most satisfaction or gives me more peace, with which I can live without being disturbed and for which at times I can always have an answer that is satisfactory. Now this satisfaction of an answer may mean that I am at a very low level of development and the less questions there are, the less of course I will ask, the easier it will be to satisfy me. And if my type happens to be a person who all the time will want to ask questions and is never really at ease and always disturbed, such a person as a different type of course will be much more difficult to satisfy and perhaps

there will not be a solution, because a fool can ask many more questions than a wise man can answer, and if one wants to have a type that ...

_____: That's getting a little personal...

Mr. Nyland: No, It is quite impersonal (because it is really a problem that one settles for one's self, and then to the extent that you say, "Yes, Gurdjieff had a good idea;"but maybe tomorrow I find an idea in Schopenhauer which I like a little better, and after that may be who knows ( ) So you see I go with the general tide of knowledge and I attach at certain times myself to that kind of a stream of knowledge which for me gives a satisfaction. Now the question is: do I want satisfaction, and do I wish really an understanding of life? And if I say it is much easier not to bother, can I gradually get free from all these ideas that I ought to bother about them? And again you see if Gurdjieff then says, "In order to understand whatever the place is of man and what he should do in order to understand it," I may not want to agree that I will have to do what he says I ought to do. And after some time I will say, "Well, Gurdjieff, go ahead; do it yourself, but I don't do it and I do something else." Now if I have enough of that kind of life force which leaves me questions, I will continue to ask the questions--and when that dies down, I can come to a conclusion that either when it dies down, I have solved the problem or I have simply lowered myself and my existence of interest. Whereever it is, it doesn't matter, because whatever someone else does, does not apply to me. And if I want to have reasonable explanation of why man on earth is the way they are, and if that means that when he is striving towards further understanding that he then meets this difficulty of being shrunk as far as time is concerned, that is that there is a time limit to his existence on earth, that because of that realization of man himself, that he wants to do something in a certain length of time and if possible, shorten the time or at least catalyzing it so that he can actually accomplish something so that it can give him freedom; then he can write

a little story about the same thing happening to His Endlessness. And I think allegorically it becomes then quite clear of what might take place at a higher plane and then we, becoming part of that what is now being created as the ray of existence and earth being at the place where it is and so forth, all the different or logical connections of whatever may be true astrologically or cosmologically or astronomically or whatever, there is psychologically in man that that finds a certain satisfaction of logically belonging together, that could give me peace of mind. You see, the questions need not always be answered as long as I know that in the direction in which I am going the possibility of an answer exists.

_____: The questions may not always bother...

Mr. Nyland: They will not bother you when I know I am on the road to solve them. All I need then is patience. When I am on the road, not knowing if they will be solved, I'm upset. And this I think gradually comes a, becomes the state of man--that he is satisfied by having questions which he starts to believe that ultimately will be answered, and that all is necessary for him is in his life time as he now lives it, gradually adds more and more to that kind of knowledge. So that man in an evolutionary scale has to have certain guideposts by which he can measure his own progress. 'Cause if he has no progress for himself, he will start to question that he is on the right road.

_____: Mr. Nyland, this was not, ah, really I think a theoretical question in the sense that just as I notice in myself quite often certain forces which in effect would pull me or urge me to go onward with the WORK, and other times there seem to be equally strong or stronger force which would say, "Why should you grow up and let it go..."

Mr. Nyland: That's right. Keep on having the forces, Tom. I mean, don't deny them. Don't say that they don't exist, and don't think on the other hand that Gurdjieff says you have to believe the way he did. I don't think it matters at all. I take from Gurdjieff whatever I think is right to the extent that I can verify it. If I cannot verify it,

it has no meaning. It has a theoretical meaning, and I can enjoy it, and I can say, "How wonderful for him that he had that kind of a philosophy," but it's not mine. You see, I think it's a very practical question of one's life that I can take that for my own which I know has already gone through me and that is corresponding to that what I now assume to be from the outside which is the same. But when I experience certain things that are contrary to what someone else is saying, I have a perfect right to disagree. Why should I take the word of someone I really don't know unless I have tremendous confidence in him and say, "Well, his word is gospel truth for me." I think if one does it, you give up a little bit of your own integrity, and I think as far as the human being is concerned he shouldn't do too much of that because it reduces for himself not only his own responsibility but also his possibility of further development. If I take constantly what my father says as the truth, then of course I don't develop because for every word I have a word of my father who has told me what is what. And the only time that I can say, "But I know," is when I have questioned what my father said and try to verify it in my own life. Now there is one thing that is the difficulty: that in my own life I will only have the possibility of testing for myself that what are my own experiences and that there may be a quantity of experiences which also belong to the totality of humanity which I perhaps ought to believe in, since they are being lived by someone else or someone else is telling me about it and about that kind of relative truth which for them may be absolute, which for me remains relative. Now if I want to continue to embellish my mind and to add to it all kinds of knowledge that I also can have belief in because someone else says so, I first have to believe, have to have belief in the person who said it. And in that what he is, or what I can make out what he was by description and what I call from my standpoint a MAN, then I would have belief in that whatever such a person has said about experiences which for me are excluded, you see. If my intention is to

accumulate the totality of all data as possible for all mankind of which I am a very small part, I have to resort, of course, to the possibility of taking belief in that what seems correct, dependent on who said it and how they arrived at it, and what their life represents. So this whole question of investigation, of course, is not only dependent on that what I can verify; it belongs to a totality of somethings which seem to be logically put together. But you know, this whole question always is what is a working hypothesis for me. And as long as such a working hypothesis in science is accepted by other people, everybody works in accordance with what is the assumption. But it is not an axiomatic truth. An axiomatic truth would mean that not at any one time, not anywhere, there would be any difference or disagreement from that law. There is no law at the present time that exists like that, except perhaps one: that's the rotation of the earth around the sun. That I think can be verified at any one place on the earth any one time and as far as I know could have been verified in the past and must be verified again in the future. This becomes an axiomatic law. But for me personally, what is axiomatic something having only lived a certain length of time limited in the number of experience that I could even direct and having to base my assumptions on that what were the experience of someone else. But for a working hypothesis it's enough, because it gives me a chance to have a certain guide for myself, which I say is like a philosophy that I can use at any one time so far as my experiences have allowed me. But if tomorrow I have an experience that doesn't seem to fit, my working hypothesis simply has to be changed. You see now, if I look at Gurdjieff that way and I say here is a man who has given a certain idea and perhaps a concept of how the universe may or may not have come into existence or whatever there is as a description of what at the present time exists, and it is logical to me and it seems to be logical also from the standpoint of different people in as far as I can face myself in their standpoint, it becomes for me a little bit more and more truthful as long as I want

to assume that that is for me a guide for me in my own life. But if my own life, for some reason or other, does not agree with such conclusions or I cannot understand the conclusions that Gurdjieff has reached, then I must be at liberty to say, "Never mind, Gurdjieff. I'm sorry I don't agree with you." Ultimately that what is most important in anyone's, man's, life is his conscience. If that isn't there, I have no measure. When I try to develop it, I probably have a better measure. And then I can say, "Yes, that is my God, voice of my God speaking within me by means of my conscience, and that it is up to me to listen to it," but it does not prevent me from being up and down every once in a while and affected one way or the other or having problems that I can at the present time not solve. I think it is a good function of life. I think it is very good to be disturbed. I think it is excellent because it shows that I am alive, that I am still open to the possibility of change. It does not mean that I have an answer for everything. I would almost say, you see, "Who wants to be dead?" That's really the criterion. And as soon as there is the least little bit of that kind of a thing settling down because of old age, because of senility, because of laziness, because of satisfaction, because of already believing that one has reached a certain levels, I think such people die. And lots of us die already and have died ( ), die much too early before physical death. The lack of interest that one has, the satisfaction with what one has reached, and the kind of friends and the limitation of the friend, and gradually eliminating all those that are enemies, reducing one's life to practically nothing, it's just a little existence, going to the office and having the slippers in the evening and a couple of children running around to take care of me, and all that, you know-- It's very nice and lovely, but it is surely not the picture of a Man who is still willing to do something. Now. Yes?

_____: Mr. Nyland, you have, ah, mentioned a number of times this

evening astrology and in relation to earth and ourselves. Intuitively I feel a relationship which I cannot explain to myself, which I am very interested in. Could you explain that?

Mr. Nyland: No. You study it.

_____: What would you ...?

Mr. Nyland: I don't know. Are you interested in astrology?

_____: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: They're enough books on it. Find out what is meant. You can even buy little books in a bookstore for every month, what sign you were born on.

_____: I'm not interested in that.

Mr. Nyland: All right, why not? _____: Ah, ...

Mr. Nyland: What are you interested in?

_____: Ah, I'm not interested in the astrology that is manufactured, ah, for, ah, the convenience of, ah, what I consider disturbed, insecure minds of, ah-- You know, it doesn't seem to work that way because intuitively I think the way you mention it is not that way, and I feel it your way, where I don't feel it the other way.

Mr. Nyland: No, well, it's right. But I--when I talk about astrology--it's just a little different...

_____: Yes. So how can I go there?

Mr. Nyland: Ah, you can. _____: Right.

Mr. Nyland: But you have to wade through a lot of stuff in order to establish a little language. Because if I use certain language you have absolutely nothing to hang it on to. Even if I in a conversation would say, "Now he belongs to Scorpio and that's in Aries," you have no idea.

_____: No.

Mr. Nyland: So you see, it would be quite useless. Of course I have not used them at the present time, but haven't really talked about astrology.

_____: Ah, well I can say I understand the signs of the Zodiac to the degree that I know the divisions. Ah, I wouldn't know if Scorpio

was in Pisces or any of these things, but I could say that basically, ah, I have a fundamental knowledge of certain aspects of astrology through readings of my own, of course, which I have not neglected in the past, but which I found very dissatisfactory. When I say I haven't read books on astrology, I have found none to date which would satisfy me except insofar as I add to my personality and walk around reading Mac Burns' astrological charts, simply because it seems the thing to do and fill up time with.

Mr. Nyland: You think if you added more and more to that kind of knowledge that you would gradually come to a state where you come to believe in it? You think there is something that is there that you could find?

Marcus : Yes, if I waded through all the junk.

Mr. Nyland: Well, maybe, but after all there is an awful lot of junk to be waded through in many directions.

Marcus : In many, and well, that is, ah, a problem, isn't it, because, ah, what junk do we get rid of first?

Mr. Nyland: Marcus, the whole life that one leads is full of junk.

Marcus : Yes, but you _____ one piece at a time.

Mr. Nyland: Yes sure. But you have to continue to live. Marcus: Yes, that...

Mr. Nyland: And you add all the time to a lot of junk. Marcus : Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You know. So if you look at it that way, how are you going to get through your own life--? By continuing to eliminate what is junk. Always. It never will be given to you on a golden platter.

Marcus : I didn't expect ...

Mr. Nyland: No, of course not. Aside from not being expected, it's impossible. Marcus : Well, I don't know...

Mr. Nyland: No. The question is that if I want to find out something, I have to dig for it. Marcus: Yes, I understand that very well.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Yes, you see, otherwise it wouldn't matter.

Marcus: O.K.! I'll dig.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. And the only way that I can say to dig is

actually to WORK. Marcus: On myself? Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Marcus: What's that got to do with astrology?

Mr. Nyland: Ah. Seek you the kingdom of heaven first and all astrological things will be added. I ought to be ashamed of myself.

Marcus: O.K. Mr. Nyland: All right, Marcus? Marcus: Thank you.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

_____: Is, ah, prolonged attention the same as self-awareness, self-alertness?

Mr. Nyland: No, Not at all. It's quite different. Attention is an ordinary mental function of a concentration of certain forms of energy of a mental kind on a particular object that can be used for observing a certain object outside of ones' self and it could be used for an observation of oneself by paying that kind of an attention to oneself. But attention in itself is not non-identified; it is not impartial. Attention, as a matter of fact, always has to remain partial because I have an interest in that what I am attentive to. Observation means that I become "aware of myself" and not only alert. The alertness is my attention; "awareness" is non-identified attention. Observation simply means in an objective sense that that what I can observe leaves me cold, that I can see "it" objectively, that I have subjective feeling, or not even an intellectual description of "it." When I am observing, I notice whatever takes place, and I will accept whatever takes place in that way it is taking place. And that I try to get this kind of impression at the time when it actually happens. So that then as a result of this kind of observation, I accumulate certain data about myself which are more truthful because they are free from any kind of personal interpretation. Attention will never give me that. Attention might give me a little bit more of a sense of aliveness because of the possibility of concentration, and with that I say, "Yes, it is very useful to me." I can because then with attention and with constant or added or more focused attention, I can then see more, and I use then the term I can observe more. But if this attention is applied to oneself

as a personality and that I am interested in the observation of my behavior forms, I have then an added difficulty because this is me, and I cannot be easily objective to myself, whereas I might be able to be more or less objective to something of the outside world in which I have no particular interest. So you see, the attention which requires an interest is exactly the wrong kind of a thing when I want to use it for observation. Observation should be understood without interest; I only call it a benevolent interest because it happens to be in a relation to me if "I" could exist and become observer, that then what is being observed, of course, has to the object for that kind of an observation. So naturally the observer has to see, that is, observe something, and that object happens to be me. But the observer is only interested in observation, not interested even in description. Attention would require definitely a description, and it would mean also an attention which engages part of me, and because of that I would be partial, that is, identified with that what receives my attention. You know much about WORK? Well, I mean, have you ever tried to be observant?

_____: I have tried it. Mr. Nyland: Could you be?

_____: Ah, at very brief moments, I think...

Mr. Nyland: Do you want to? _____: I think I want to; I...

Mr. Nyland: As long as it's still in the thinking state, then of course it is not as yet translated into any particular actuality. See, if you wish, if you find out. After all you will never find out until you experience it, and then if you do and you make attempt at observation, you also will know that it's a different kind of a mental function as compared to giving thing attention.

_____: Sometimes when I'm painting or sketching something and in a ..... Mr. Nyland: But that is subjective.

_____: Somehow I can see myself painting.

Mr. Nyland: You're not. I doubt it. You will remember that you have been painting. You don't see yourself paint, because you're completely

identified with your painting, and there is nothing in you that could be objective about you painting. It's much too difficult, and in the beginning you might have a flash of a moment of a realization that you have been painting, and then in your memory you remember that. But that is not observation. A man has only a total quantity of energy available for the different things he wants to do. It varies of course; it is not always the same, but sometimes things that are of interest to me, I seem to have more energy for. Particularly when I am painting and I want to do it right and I give it that kind of an attention and I focus everything in me that I want to do it right as far as my dexterity is concerned or that what I want to do mentally, that is that I see things, or what I want to put in it, lets say, of an emotional quality as far as art is concerned, then, of course, it engages all of me and at that time all the energy, if I'm honest, will go in that direction, and there is no energy left for the possibility of observation. That's why I say it cannot be done. It can be done if one reduces the activity to its simplest form, and if I reduce myself as an active person to its simplest form--then there is a change that the quantity of energy is a little bit more than what is needed for the continuation of my activity, and with that kind of energy, I may be able to become objective to that what is taking place. Think some more about it and see if you can come to a conclusion you want to find out. You'll never find out until you do.

_____: Mr. Nyland, what do you mean by reducing one's active self to ...

Mr. Nyland: What's the difference between someone who is sent..... who is tense and a person who is relaxed? There is always a quantity of energy needed for doing that what you want to do. Sometimes that what I want to do requires a very small amount of energy, but when I'm trying to do it, many other things take place that I cannot control and simply happen to be a habitual way of looking. For instance, I lift something up. All that is needed is an amount of energy giving my arms a certain

strength and the direction by my mind of wanting to pick it up. And I bend over, and I get hold of whatever it, the string and so forth, and I lift the package up. While I now do this, habitually I will probably have an expression on my face which indicates that the package is very heavy, and when someone else is around, I probably would like to indicate that I am pretty good and that I can lift that package and for the sake of being admired, I will say, "Oh, how heavy!" These things are not needed for the actuality of lifting that package or whatever I call my activity. Now this very simple ( ). In any kind of an activity that I am engaged in, I use always much more energy than is necessary. It is not a question of planning--like, for instance, you plan in the kitchen and you don't want to walk too often, to the fridgidaire or to a pan that you have forgotten, and so forth; you want everything within reach. I don't mean that, but I mean that when you are stirring something, as a soup, that there are many more muscles in your body that are not required for either standing or stirring. That sometimes the question of expenditures of energies in different kind of form, not only the activity of the body but that what are thoughts and what are feelings which quite definitely require a certain form of energy, these are quite useless. And that many times I catch myself talking without any sense or that I happen to have thoughts or feelings which of course are none of my business, but I like to be engaged in them. Now if I start to judge it from a utilitarian standpoint that this is not necessary and that is not necessary, of course, I can reduce my life to living on bread and water and only having a little chair or perhaps something as a bench on which I can sleep, or maybe I sleep on the floor. So the reduction of one's life to that kind of simplicity is of course quite possible if one wants it for some reason or other. At the same time by eliminating the different kind of impressions that I would receive in ordinary life, my contact with other people, or by eating things that require a little bit more digestive power on my part or that what gives me a certain form

of taste or the being interested in the psyche of someone else: all of that enables me to derive from such contact more energy for myself. So you see, there is a certain limit below which I don't want to go. I don't want to reduce myself to an utter minimum in which I am nothing else but a lump of flesh because I'm a human being. So for me to find where is the place that I use whatever energy is needed for the maintenance of myself and at the same time receive enough energy from the outside world in order to continue to live and consider myself a Man. Or rather a human being which lives in our present society. Now if one is interested in that kind of a problem from the standpoint of conservation, or if one is interested from the standpoint of how little can I live on, or how much can I derive from others by being less open to all possibilities which I now receive, or if I wish to discriminate between that what affects me and which I consider useful and the different things which also affect me which are quite useless, you see, I face a problem here. How will I live in life, being affected by everything that I happen to see or hear, anything that reaches me through sense organs. I have the problem of digesting that form of energy as are impressions, and to utilize within myself enough of that kind of energy for the purpose of myself living and having in myself a wish to continue to live in the best way I can and perhaps also have with it enough energy which I then can convert or at least change in some way or other in inspiration or aspiration. When I consider this problem of what is a human being supposed to be and how should he be in relation to other people and what are--when he finds himself in life--alive to possibilities for himself, that then he has to consider that whatever his body is, whatever his mind is, whatever his feeling is as a manager of such forms of energies which he becomes responsible. And therefore at certain times when he realizes that there is too much leakage, he has to stop it. Otherwise he is not a good manager. It depends on how serious one takes one's responsibility for one's life. The whole problem is connected with it. If I say I allow myself to do

this and that, then I can continue to live. Surely I can become a hermit, I can live in an ivory tower, I can go to an uninhabited island, I can withdraw from society, I can be passing people with an ( ) and tell them to go to hell, and all that I wish I have completely in my hand, to do whatever I like with my life, and if I have obligations, I can even say I don't honor them. But you see, all of that becomes a complicated story for myself, and when I continue to try to remain at least honest about what I am, I will have to continue to think about it and to feel. I cannot help it I cannot reduce those to such an ( ) Ah, that I become a little ( ). Just a little bit of a lung, you know, that is doing that; that's not a human being. I think it's possible to reduce one's activities much more than we do. I think there is much more expenditures than are absolutely necessary. I think there are muscular tensions which don't belong to the body at all. I think there is prattle and battle and nonsence that is talked about at the expense of oneself. Energies. ...that there is much too much eating, there is much too much of so-called breathing in of air, much too much feeling and mixing into someone else's business, much too much discussion about things that have absolutely no concern and simply keep the talking machine going. Each person has to find out for himself where is that particular level on which he wants to live. It may change. When one grows older, it changes one way or the other. The desires of a man grow sometimes, sometimes quite unnecessarily, sometimes one assumes that one cannot live without this and that, that you have to have carpet from wall to wall on the floor, who knows. So now what other questions are there more things we want to talk about? Or could you distill out of this totality of bla, fla, bla, so forth, something for yourself, that you can use for yourself? Yes, what is it?

_____: I would like to know something about, ah, for instance, during the course of a lifetime, I have, well, we have, certain moments I think when we, ah, realize that we are puppets reacting to everything around us and not really acting. And I wondered if you could, ah, tell me

a little bit about those moments in relation to Gurdjieff?

Mr. Nyland: But you know them, don't you?

_____: Well, ah, through experiencing them...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I mean Gurdjieff might mention them, but you verify for yourself that you are a reactive kind of a creature. _____: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I mean, that for you is verifiable.

_____: I don't know it all the time.

Mr. Nyland: No, no, that may be so. At times I don't know that I have a temper. _____: Right.

Mr. Nyland: But I have one. You see, I don't have to know everything at any-one time always. If I describe myself, I may leave out certain things that I am, and of course, it's logical. If you describe the earth, you don't describe the part that is dark. You describe your own little surrounding in your locality and about the places where you have been. But you know that if you have not been in Java you don't describe it. Still it exists, so in the totality of the experiences of one's life during a day or during a year, I am subject to all kinds of conditions from the outside which will react on me, or rather towards which I will react, and dependent entirely on whatever it is that affects me, where it affects me, and how deep it affects me, to that extent I will react in a certain way and afterwards what I call an action will be based on that what has already been received in me, and totally when I see and when I start to study myself and particularly when I make this question of reactivity a problem, that then of course I will start to add more and more experiences that are in that kind of section of my knowledge and if I really become interested in it, I don't dare to make a move to see if the next moment I would react again and again and again. Now there is no objection in trying to do that only if you try to be reacting only when you walk on the street you're not very good for the walking, and it may require a certain times when you're interested in this reactivity of your-self that you stand still and you don't walk. I think it's quite logical that at certain times I don't know that I am reacting, and at such moments simply

help me to sustain myself in ordinary life. I have not in myself enough cells that could represent an "I"--visual eye. There are only certain cells that have that function. There are different organs in the body each having a function to fulfill. The totality of me makes up my personality, and if I say to my "I" that an ear exists, I think the "I" would agree. But it does not mean that the "I" has to function as an ear. The totality of man either as a body is made up of so many cells which have no more function than just supporting, and in the experiences of any one man during a day, there are only a few moments that he comes to the--that is comes to his attention that he is reacting. It is not necessary I say to be all the time having that on the tip of my tongue because I would be incapable of fulfilling other kind of function which are also required of me when I am living my daily life. But you see when it is important that I have to act and not react, when then it comes to my attention that I do as usual in a reactive way, I then say, "Yes, under such and such a condition I am a reacting creature, and I know that if such and such a condition again will happen, I will react in the same way;" that in general I say I am a reacting creature applying it only to those situations where it is necessary for me to have an activity and that that activity is really activity as a result of what I have received from the outside. You understand what I mean? _____: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: It has nothing to do with how often you are reactive, as long as you did it once, you already would be a reactive creature. If against that, you could have moments in which you did not react, you would say, "But I am not entirely reactive." And this is the way then to oppose it, you might say. That at times when I see that I habitually would react, at such a time I would say, "I act." How to do it is a little difficult. Reaction usually is that whenever I have received any kind of an impression on me that the reaction is immediately followed by a certain change of direction of my activity. When I receive an impression that comes into me, when it is a reaction it goes out of me, and it is very much like a light-ray which is reflected. The moment at which it reaches me, at that same moment it has a certain ten-

dency to react and using the energy which is given to me now for the opposite direction of going away. This is what is called mechanicality because I have no control and it is like the reflex of a light ray on a surface in which nothing special happens when it is a white surface, then only reflecting that what is received as light. Now if it were possible for me at a time when I receive impressions, which in a habitual way would be followed by an ordinary reaction, that at the point when I receive them, I would have a chance to wait, and if at that time I could then decide I will want to do this or that and I would consider it, it would be the beginning of a certain form of control in which I am not entirely reactive. I may end up by doing a certain activity which corresponds to my habitual behavior, but I also have a chance that if I could wait for a moment and consider it, that I have a chance in thinking and in thinking about it, I could decide which is the best thing to do. I say it's the beginning of an inroad of not allowing certain things to take place mechanically. I will introduce something that has a certain power to direct. It is not WORK; it may need to WORK; it is something which is changing me, but it is still quite unconscious. And it is only in that way when I say "yes" under the influence of thinking about WORK, all of a sudden a thought or a feeling struck me that WORK exists and here I am angry and because of that I happen to think and change my angry state. It is not a guarantee that I have been AWAKE. All it is is a change of an object which if I could observe "it" would have been exactly the same for me if "it" was angry or not. But the fact of the observation would mean that something would have been present to the activity that took place including the reactivity and on the other hand, now I break up this mechanical form of behavior, you might say I split it. And before it goes out as a reaction I start to direct it. It is an unusual form of behavior for me, and at such a time there may be a chance that I can really observe it or look at it or become aware of it and to see that that is like a reacting, and reactive creature that it would form and follow its usual mechanical pattern, that now there is the possibility of a choice. And then if I become sufficiently aware, I may be able

to control the expression and not go over into an angry state but withhold it. You see, there are many different ways by which one can gradually can make little inroads on, into one's unconscious state. But you have to be careful that you understand what is the difference between an alertness, and an increased alertness, and an awareness. I say it is difficult, because the awareness includes,at that moment, an alertness with so-called impartiality. But otherwise it is like a little philosophical question. What is WORK and where does it start? For instance, I want to go from New York to Philadelphia. And I consider Philadelphia on a little higher plane because for me it is like a change from unconsciousness to consciousness. It is now my wish that I go from one place to the other, and since it is of a different kind of level,I would indicate it by the difference in the step, a step that I have to step up. Then I would be in Philadelphia, and if I step down, I'M still in New York. Those are two points which are at the present time still separated by means of space or light. And I now set out wanting to go to Philadelphia and taking this step. Now what do I do when I'm still in New York? I think about the possibility of Philadelphia, I think about the trip, I think about what I should take with me, I prepare myself. All of this I would not do, unless I knew that there is a Philadelphia. Now the question is: does that belong to WORK? My answer is no; it's preparation. Although it has to do with WORK, it is not work; I go now on the road from New York to Philadelphia, and I reach this particular step and when I am ready to go up vertically on that step, I will only be in Philadelphia when I am on the next step. Now of course I make an effort when I get to the first... to the step and I want to step up. Is that effort WORK or not? You see again, it is a question of how will I define it. Of course all the way between New York and Philadelphia, if I get half way, I already become interested in Philadelphia and perhaps more and more interested the closer I get to it, and perhaps even influenced by it. Is that WORK or not? I'm on the way to try to become conscious; I'm not as yet. But do I already derive from the fact that I want to become conscious a certain state in which there is a little bit more light as compared to the state of darkness when I was in New York

You understand these things are difficult to define, and you can say it one way or the other if you wish. You say, "Sure, as soon as I start preparing, I am already in WORK," and I won't deny it. But I say the preparation is not the same as the actuality of taking a step, and as soon as the effort has been made to be conscious, then I am WORKING. So it is not that kind of a mental process of wanting to think and continue to think about WORK; it will never lead me to any stepwise growth; it will lead me on a certain surface of improving on that particular level whatever I can, and I can prepare from all I'm worth, but I will not reach Philadelphia until I make the effort of introducing an awareness in my state in which I now call my mental functioning, that that what is now an alertness of that what I notice, now has to be received in such a place that it is free from interpretation. This would be the awareness, that would mean the step up, that would mean the light of ray entering into the darkness.

_____: Would that be called WORK?

Mr. Nyland: That would be called WORK. Whenever I realize that I am unconscious, I am already interested in trying to find out what it might be if I could become conscious. And the effort at WORK is that I, at that moment, try to take of myself an observation in which that what I observe I will accept for whatever it is, without any wish to change it, without having any qualification for it, without classifying it, just to accept it the way and the condition it is, if I possibly can at the moment when it does happen, because at that moment I can be quite sure that only in the moment my ordinary mental processes are not functioning; that is, there is no thought and that my feeling center will not influence any kind of a thought of myself. It's a difficult problem if one wants to introduce this question of simultaneity and momentary living, non-dimensional existence and so forth, but that always exists. It exists everywhere in anyone who wants to get out of a life...of a certain world of dimensions into a world of non-dimensions. It always remains a problem; it doesn't make any difference. It's a difference also between God and the Devil. It's a difference also between man as he is

and Man as he should be. It is always; there is always that same kind of a problem which will occur in any kind of a religion or any kind of a philosophy. How to get out of the bondage of earth! That is really the problem. How to get free from it, how to get rid of it!

_____: Would that be called the bondage of symbols too?

Mr. Nyland: What?

_____: Would that, the bondage of symbols, would that be a lesser bondage?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, if you understand the symbol, surely. Quite right. But the symbol has to mean that I do WORK. The symbol is not there just to look at, and the symbol is not just to enjoy it even if you know what it means. The symbol is something that in its symbolism tells me to WORK. And as a matter of fact, unless I WORK, I will never understand the symbol. The practical difficulty is always that I want to retain knowledge for whatever it is worth for myself without really verifying that it is knowledge, and it will never give me any bread unless I use it in the application of that what is my ordinary life, and mostly what I use as far as behavior of my body is concerned. This always becomes the important part: that it is never my own unless it has gone through me and the totality of me. When it stayed only in a little part of myself, like my mind, of course, it is part of the mind, but it is not part of my life. Well, let's leave it. In other different kind of questions that you want to think about and bring up, next week. No, you're late now, because John will not allow me to talk any more, because if I do and it runs off the tape and the other one doesn't, he has to splice it, and that means more work for him. So being considerate, we'll wait and you ask the question next week. All right. Good night everybody. See you, I hope, next week.